REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to *Tajima et al.*

Claims 1-8, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,608 to *Springer*.

Claims 11-13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art and *Springer* as applied to claims 1-8, 10, and 14 and in further view of *Tajima et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claim 9 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections under §§ 102(b) and 103(a).

Accordingly, claims 1-17 are presently pending for further consideration.

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Tajima et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As amended, independent claim 9 recites a driving method of a liquid crystal display comprising, in part, the step of implementing a second picture of the second field in a second area of the liquid crystal display such that a brightness level of the second picture has a different

brightness level than a brightness level of the first picture in accordance with a type of image of the second picture. *Tajima et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least these features.

Although the Office relies upon column 12, lines 19-46 of *Tajima et al.* to allege anticipation of claim 9, the Office failed to equate specific portions of *Tajima et al.* with claimed features. *Tajima et al.* discloses one frame having a plurality of sub-frames with each sub-frame associated with different luminance levels, and correcting the luminance level of a subframe in one frame with that of an adjoining frame. (Col. 12, lines 19-29.) *Tajima et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least that the second picture has a different brightness level than a brightness level of the first picture in accordance with a type of image of the second picture as recited in claim 9.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. Because *Tajima et al.* fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 9, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1 and 7

Claims 1-8, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art in view of *Springer*. Claims 11-13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art and *Springer* as applied to claims 1-8, 10, and 14 and further in view of *Tajima et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display including, in part, a video processor generating processed data to implement a brightness level at a specific area of the liquid crystal display

panel that is different from a remaining area of the liquid crystal display panel and a position designator designating the specific area of the liquid crystal display panel where the processed data is implemented and a position designator designating the specific area of the liquid crystal display panel where the processed data is implemented.

The Office equates VSP 150 in the graphic controller 145 of *Springer* with the claimed video processor. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display including a video processor. The VSP 150 is equipped on the main board of computer system 100, not monitor 80.

Further, the Office equates the claimed position designator with the graphic controller 145 of the *Springer*. However, the graphic controller 145 of *Springer* is equipped on the main board of computer system 100, not in the CRT display device 80.

Claim 7 recites a liquid crystal display including, in part, a video processor for generating processed data for the specific area from the position data and the data such that the brightness level of the processed data for the specific area is different than the brightness level of the data and a timing controller realigning the data and the processed data.

As discussed above, the VSP 150 is equipped on the main board of the computer system 100, not monitor 80. Therefore, the VSP 150 does not communicate with a timing controller of monitor 80.

Further, in *Springer*, as the computer system 100 supplies the data to the CRT 80, it is not required to have data relating to the pixel structure of the LCD panel. Accordingly, *Springer*

does not include at least a timing controller for rearranging the processed data as recited in claim 7.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because Applicant's Related Art or *Springer*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 7, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. *Tajima et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Applicant's Related Art or *Springer*. As claims 2-6, 8, and 10-17 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 7, claims 2-6, 8, and 10-17 are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: September 4, 2007

By: _____
Kyle J. Choi
Reg. 41,480

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001